CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa lii, 7.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT NO. 1, CHATHAM SQUARE, BY P. PRICE, AT $2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOL. I. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1831. NO. 2.

ORIGINAL SERMON.

By Br. L. F. W. Andrews.

"He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his son."

1st John v, 10, 11.

The assent of the mind to any truth which is embraced by the understanding, may be said to be a *belief* of that truth. It matters not in what manner the understanding is enlightened in regard to any proposition, whether from moral or mathematical demonstration, or from sufficient testimony of credible witnesses, the result is the same—the assent of the mind *to* or belief *in* the fact or proposition submitted to it. The withholding of this assent of the mind, is *unbelief*; and it is a self-evident axiom that no man can believe that which is not recognized by his understanding, no matter how *true* the thing to be believed may be in itself. If the evidence of a truth be wanting, the mind cannot embrace that truth, and is therefore in a state of unbelief in regard to that particular matter. To change this state of *unbelief* to its reverse, such evidence must be presented to the understanding, as will convince it of the truth, and the work is done. Without such evidence, it is impossible for the assent of the mind to be given to any proposition whatever. To arrive at the belief of any event which has transpired in another country and in another age of the world, we must have the evidence of responsible witnesses. Our belief in the existence of a place called London, is as sure and unchangeable as if we all had ocular demonstration of the fact—for the united and uncontradicted testimony of thousands who have seen the place, and borne record of its existence, is convincing to the mind. For me to *disbelieve* a fact of such a character is impossible—my mind cannot withhold its assent to a truth which is established by so great a mass of uncontradicted and disinterested testimony. *Again.* The existence of any abstract fact, which is *self*-evident, is acknowledged by the mind *at once*. For instance the proposition that *two* and *two* make *four*, or that the *sun* shines. A *disbelief* of such facts is as much a moral impossibility as to *believe* that we have not an existence. It is therefore evident that the mind can neither *believe* without testimony, nor *disbelieve* when the understanding embraces a proposition, and the judgment is convinced of its truth. The necessary inference from these premises is, that the *will* of mankind has nothing to do with the operations of faith or unbelief. Our *wishing* a thing to be *true*, will by no means cause us to *believe* that which we are convinced is *not true*.

Furthermore. The assent of the mind to a truth, or the contrary, will have no effect to *change* that truth. Our belief or unbelief cannot destroy that which is an attribute of the immutable Jehovah;—nor are we called on to believe any thing which is above our finite understanding. If the evidences of any truths are not sufficient to satisfy the mind, it is, nevertheless, as much a *truth* as ever. It is rather our misfortune than our fault that we cannot believe a truth, if we use all the means in our power to enlighten our understandings on the subject. As far as any responsibility is attached to our unbelief of any proposition *above our capacity* to *understand*, we stand on the same ground with infants and idiots, for the plain reason that what we are unable to comprehend is to us a *dead letter*. There is, in such a case, no law "worked out by the understanding," and "where there is no law there is no transgression." Instead, therefore, of denouncing those who may not see with our eyes, or believe as we believe, we should endeavor to convince and enlighten their minds, and if that should be impossible, look with pity and compassion upon those errors which are the result of a beclouded understanding.

In the words of our text, we are called on indirectly to believe a *truth* there recorded. What this truth is, will now claim our attention. "*And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.*" It will be observed that the *life* here spoken of is *eternal*, and that it is the *gift* of God. It is not therefore in the nature of a *reward* for any good we have done, or benefit conferred on the Deity, but a free, unpurchased, invaluable gift. It is an emanation of the "good pleasure" of a God of love and unlimited benevolence. It is a gift prepared "before the foundation of the world," by a merciful and gracious Creator—a *commendation* of his infinite love to the creatures he has made. For the benevolent purpose of making known his divine will in behalf of mankind, our Heavenly Parent commissioned and sent forth his well beloved son, as a "witness of the" glorious "truth," that *eternal life* was given us, *in* and *through* the Saviour, and that "he that *believeth* on him *hath* everlasting life," and "should not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." From these passages and numerous others, we ascertain that the *eternal life* given us by Jehovah is enjoyed in a degree by the *believer* here upon earth. The past and present tenses of the verb are used by the inspired penman, and by Christ himself—"He that believeth *hath* everlasting life." In another place we have a particular definition of the life spoken of thus: "*This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.*" A *knowledge* of God and of his son Jesus Christ, is therefore the life which is given to us. This knowledge may be received, imperfectly it is true, while we sojourn in this "tabernacle of clay." The *beginning* of so important an acquisition, is *in life*, but its complete attainment is only to be had when we shall have put off the robes of mortality and corruption, and have received an entrance into that "house not made with hands" eternal and *indissoluble*—when we shall have passed the portals of immortality through the way opened up by him who is "the *resurrection* and the *life*."

Nor is this eternal life to be the portion of the *believer* only. True, the unbeliever cannot enjoy the blessed influences of the gift, so long as he remains under the condemnation of ignorance and sin—so long as he has not the evidence which is necessary to remove his *unbelief*. But we are assured that all mankind will eventually be benefitted by the mission of the Gospel—that Christ came to be the "Saviour of the world"—that he "gave himself a ransom for *all* to be testified in due time"—that "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive"—that "as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation—so by the righteousness of one, the *free gift* came upon *all* unto justification of life." We are also assured that "God has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain *salvation* by our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us, that whether *we wake or sleep*, we should live together with him—That "we see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels crowned with glory and honor that he by the grace of God should taste death for *every* man." Our blessed Saviour himself says, "This is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of *all* which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day"—and again, "*All* things are delivered unto me of my Father." Now it is certainly a fair conclusion to draw from these heart cheering texts, that, if *all* things have been delivered by the Father to the son, and it is the Father's will that of all which he hath thus given, Christ "should lose nothing but raise it up again at the last day," there cannot be a single exception in the case, more especially as it was the "meat and drink" of the Saviour "to do the will of the Father." Where then is the ground for the opinion so prevalent, that but *a few* will finally enjoy the gift of eternal life? Is it not possible for Deity to remove all *unbelief*, and every other impediment to the reception of his own choicest blessings? Because mankind do not *all in time* have "joy and peace in believing," shall we, therefore, limit the power of the Almighty, and say he will not "do according to his pleasure in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth?" What his will and pleasure are, we have already seen, and surely we are the children of scepticism, if we cannot believe that a being, *infinite in power*, can perform all his own purposes without difficulty—If we cannot see that it would require no greater effort of supreme might to change *unbelief to faith* in the moment of the final *resurrection* "of the just and the unjust," than it would to cause that resurrection itself. We cannot discover that our want of faith should frustrate the designs of our creator, even were it possible that we could bestow our belief when and how we pleased, independent of any evidence. Much less so, when we know that *faith* is the result of a process of reasoning from testimony of some kind or other, and that the *powers* of *reasoning* and the *testimony* are *both* the gift of a superior intelligence—not acquisitions of our own. The gift of *reason* is one of the most invaluable ever bestowed; without it the world would be one grand *lunatic* asylum—a very *bedlam*. Men may decry the use of it, and call it "*carnal*"—they may say that "heaven's best gift to man" should not be depended on in matters of religion; but they should learn that in throwing aside *reason*, they throw with it all *responsibility*, and substitute in its stead the ravings of insanity and the visions of idiocy. They should know that without *reason*, man would be as the brute that perisheth—the creature of instinct, the heir of mortality, and the victim of eternal insensibility. Unless, therefore, Deity has bestowed this gift upon mankind to be exercised independent of its author and in accordance with the creature's *will*, which *will* is likewise independent of the creator, it can be no obstacle to *infinite purposes*, let the exercise of reason result in *faith* or *unbelief*.

We have thus endeavored to establish the several propositions, that *faith* is independent of the *will*, and is the effect of reasoning from testimony—that *truth* to be believed must be *under-*

stood—that *faith* or *unbelief* cannot make that *true* which was *not truth* before—that *life eternal* which is given in Christ is a free gift to *all* men, though all men may not *in life* enjoy it—and that this circumstance does not render it impossible for God to cause all *unbelief* to be removed in his own time, and in the moment of the *resurrection*. If such be truths, all should *believe* the "record" to whom God has imparted the understanding, and afforded testimony sufficient to convince that understanding. If there is a single individual who has not or will not receive *eternal life*, he cannot believe the truth of the record, nor ever will. For an individual in an endless hell to believe he had eternal life, would be to believe a lie. For him to *know* that eternal life was not to be his portion throughout eternity, and yet be called on to believe the reverse, would be an unreasonable requisition, because it is impossible. Deity could not expect any of his creatures to believe what did not or could not exist. Nor could any who had not eternal life, "make 'God a liar," or impeach his veracity, by believing the *truth* as experienced by them which is the *reverse* of eternal life. If therefore *all* men are invited to believe the record God hath given us of his son, or else make out a charge of falsehood against Deity, the truth is *unchangeable* that *all* will partake of the gift bestowed, without a solitary exception. Our Merciful Judge will never call upon us to believe that which is not *true*—nor will disbelieving that which is not true "make God a liar." It is disbelieving the truth of the record which is, "that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his son," which impeacheth the eternal truth of Deity. The record is a simple unalterable truth to all who are called on to believe it. The *unbelief* of any, (as before stated,) will not change the *truth* to a *lie*, and there is no limit to the invitation to believe. The whole family of rational intelligences are included in the requisition to believe, or else by their unbelief "make God a liar."

And are there any, whose impious thoughts would for a moment dare to arraign the veracity of their Creator and their God, in this manner? Are there any who profess to take the Bible for their standard and to yield implicit belief to the precepts and doctrines therein contained, who dispute the truth of God's record as given in our text?—Would to heaven it could be said with truth that even the many professing christians of the land did not disbelieve the truth of this record!—But what are the facts of the case? Do not the various denominations of professing Christians in our day, with two or three exceptions, believe that God hath not given mankind "eternal life," nor ever will. Do they not hold to the sentiment that "eternal death" or rather *eternal dying*, yet *never death*, will be the portion of a majority of God's creatures? And do they not thus impeach the veracity of the eternal? In the spirit of Christian charity we should judge that "*they err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God.*" Their non-compliance with the injunction of our text to "believe," is the result of their ignorance of the requirement therein contained. Their understandings have not been enlightened on the subject—the time and talents and labor of their teachers being spent in attempting to prove the reverse of the truth there recorded. Eternal death and everlasting damnation are the themes upon which they delight to dwell. They do indeed teach that a *few* are *elected* to "eternal life"—that there is a class of mankind who may be called the "good society"—the priviledged religious *aristocracy* of the land, on whose part it will be deemed somewhat of a condescension to take a seat in Heaven, even near to the humble publican! But how seldom do we hear any thing about the *universality* of the eternal life, given by Jehovah, that "Christ came into the *world* that the world through him might be saved"—that he "tasted death for every man," and that God is "not willing that any should perish." Such discourses are "like angel's visits, few and far between," and when they come, they limit the power and goodness of Jehovah, and in a great measure, render void the mission of our Saviour. This class of unbelievers are firmly persuaded, they say, of the truth, of christianity and of the revelation of divine will as given in the sacred Scriptures, and yet they reject the combined testimony of the prophets, our Saviour, and the Apostles, as to one of the principal items of the record. They will not allow that the declaration of Jehovah that "he *willeth* not that any should perish, but that *all* should come to the knowledge of the truth," is literally true, but to get round a difficulty which they cannot well get over, or put out of their way, they will tell us that God has *two wills* on this subject—a revealed will as just stated, and a secret unrevealed will, directly the reverse of the first, which embraces only an elect few—not the whole race of Adam! *How* the learned *magi* of our day happened to find out the *secret* will of Deity; and *how* that is any longer a *secret* which has been brought to light by *their* instrumentality, we are not informed, and are rather disposed to think we shall not soon get any satisfactory information in regard to the mystery. If the absurd supposition is admitted, the charge of *partiality* must lie against Deity in all its force, notwithstanding its dishonoring character and results. Again—The *unbeliever* in the record impeaches the goodness and power of Jehovah as well as his truth. The idea of *infinite goodness* is incompatible with the eternal misery of one of the least of God's creatures. If a single soul is left to everlasting suffering, when Deity *can* but *will not* save, he cannot be *infinite* in goodness—and if God wills the salvation of all and cannot accomplish his purposes, he is not *infinite* in power.

The *unbeliever* in the record, who limits eternal life to the few and believes in the everlasting punishment of the many, *likewise* makes the creator a *revengeful tyrant*, who punishes his offspring, without any view to the reformation of the offender, and without any regard to the example to others—for the idea of *endless* punishment is utterly irreconcileable with either object. Such are the results of the *unbelief* of the record given in our text, fairly traced out. It not only impeaches the eternal truth of the supreme being—but denies his infinite goodness and power, and makes him a partial, revengeful, and malignant tyrant. Such is the God of limitarianism—a being who is not infinite in any of his attributes—the partial judge and implacable ruler. No wonder is it, therefore, that mankind *fear* instead of *loving* such a hideous *caricature* of omnipotence. 'Twere a gross libel upon the majesty of Heaven to insinuate that *he* is such a being. And yet many there are, who not only insinuate it, but openly advocate a system which positively *implies* the existence of a supreme being, who is

> "*Partial, changeful, passionate, unjust,*
> *Whose attributes are rage, revenge, and lust.*"

And that such a being has by his sovereign decree created worlds and peopled the same, and has *predetermined from all eternity to damn* a large portion of his creatures, or, (which amounts to the same thing,) that he KNEW (*when creating*) that such would be the inevitable result. Notwithstanding all this, how often are mankind *mocked* with entreaties and calls to repentance and faith—though their Deity has resolved according to these views that the *non-elect* shall only be *tantalized* with the offer of life—without intending they should ever receive it. The inconsistency and absurdity of such a system is well delineated in the following stanzas: says the preacher,

> "*This is a special time of grace,*
> *God's mercy soon will leave the place,*
> *If you should not repent this night,*
> *You'll be in hell ere morning light;*
> *Though God did all predestinate,*
> *Yet* NOW'S *a time for reprobate,*
> *For* ALL *may come of* EVERY *sect,*
> *Yet* NONE CAN COME EXCEPT *the* ELECT."

There is another class of mankind who do not believe the record that "God hath given us eternal life and this life is in his son"—viz.: the sceptic and the atheist. This class of mankind have in some measure examined into the nature of the popular systems of misnamed christianity; and their *matured* intellects have turned in disgust from the horrid representations they have seen and heard of a supreme being and the absurd dogmas said to be taught in the Bible. They have not been able to reconcile the *contradictions* every where presented to them as infallible *truths*, and in consequence, have, in many cases, not only rejected Revelation, but have denied the existence of a supreme intelligence himself. Such men have taken the *absurdities*, the *cruelty*, and the *inconsistencies* of the "*creeds and commandments of men*," for the wisdom, mercy, and truth of *Christianity*—they have been employed in investigating the nature of the filthy covering with which man has disfigured her *fair* features, and not finding any thing comely or attractive, they have pronounced the whole an *imposture* and a *cheat*, undeserving of the attention of sensible men. Let such be persuaded to renew their investigations, assured that the *dogmas* of the schools are no part of the system of *Christianity*, and their conclusions may be different. To the unbeliever in a *great first cause*, if such there is, we would say—go out into the world and view the grand display of wisdom and power every where manifested—visit the observatory of the Astronomer, and through his magnifying glasses view the innumerable worlds which adorn the azure vault of Heaven—witness the order and regularity of the planetary and solar systems, all moving on without jar or derangement—and *learn* that this globe which we inhabit is not only "carried round every day from East to West, along with its vast population," but is "impelled forward through the regions of space at the rate of 68,000 miles per hour," and yet, that the Earth is but a planet herself, revolving in perfect order around the *Sun*, the centre of her system. When he is satisfied that so much harmony and beauty could not exist without a *great first cause*, whose attributes must be *infinite wisdom* and *power*, we would invite him to enter the Hall of the *Anatomist*, and in the examination of the human system, ascertain the solemn truth that man is "fearfully and wonderfully made"—and that "ten thousand of vessels, tubes, bones, muscles, ligaments, membranes, motions, contrivances, and adaptations, beyond the reach of the human understanding fully to investigate or comprehend, must be arranged, and act in harmonious concert, before any one sense belonging to him can perceive and enjoy its objects." Let him also learn the truth, that were any of the thousand parts which "compose that complicated machine the eye, either wanting or deranged; were it changed into a different form or placed in a different position; were even a single muscle to lose its capacity of acting, we might be deprived of all the enchanting prospects of the earth and heavens and be enveloped in the darkness of eternal night: such is the skill and intelligence necessary for accomplishing, even *in a single organ*, the purposes" to which it is applied. If after such a view, any further testimony was necessary to produce conviction that "*the* hand that made us is *Divine*," we should doubt whether *reason* was not withheld from the unbeliever altogether, and that of course (therefore) the most conclusive evidence could have no influence upon him.

Let him also who is a believer in the existence of a supreme being, but who disbelieves the

truths of Revelation, as set forth in the sacred scriptures, give a critical attention to the proofs presented in their favor. Let him compare the Prophecies of the Old Testament with their accomplishment in the new—Let him examine the *internal* evidences of the gospel of Jesus, *contrasted* with the other systems of the world—let him investigate the subject calmly and dispassionately, and bring to his aid all the collateral evidence from profane history and elsewhere in favor of the *authenticity* of the Bible, and he will then at least have done his duty, if he does not rise from the inquiry with strong convictions that *there is a reality in revelation*. When a belief in revelation is obtained, it will only remain for each of the characters just noticed, to collect the testimony of Christ, the Prophets and the Apostles, in order to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt, that "God *hath* given us *eternal life* in his son."

There is yet a third class of the human family who do not "believe the record God hath given of his son," viz. : the *openly profane* and the *ungodly*. This class have never troubled themselves about such matters, and are ignorant of the requirement of the text. They, like Gallio of old, "care for none of these things," and cannot be persuaded to search the scriptures, although assured that *there* will be found the record of God, that he that believeth "shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Would that such would search the word of God for the glorious truths contained therein. Instead of groping their way through the darkness of error and vice, without a ray of light to shed its radiance on their path—let them look to this sacred volume where "life and immortality are brought to light through the Gospel," and let them examine the testimony and the prophets, and see if it be not a truth of divine origin that "God hath given us *eternal life*" through Christ our Saviour. A *knowledge* of this truth will make them *free* from "the bondage of sin and corruption," and bring them "into the glorious liberty of the children of God." They will *then* have the "witness within themselves" that the record is *true*, and will experience the "joy and peace" of the Christian, and can unite in ascriptions of gratitude and thankfulness "to him who sitteth on the throne and to the lamb forever."

METHODISM VS. UNIVERSALISM.

The following, entitled "Important Questions," was published several years since, in the form of a Tract, a copy of which, we are informed, fell into the hands of a Methodist clergyman, who has annexed certain remarks; probably intended by him as an answer to the questions. A friend has furnished the questions and the annexed remarks by the Methodist gentleman, and requested the same to be published in your paper.

We shall not question the sincerity of the Methodist gentleman; we shall only take the liberty of saying, that, in our opinion, his remarks are unworthy the name of an answer to the questions. Every intelligent reader will make just comments. To show the gross ignorance of the Methodist remarker, we point to his answer to question 15, where he quotes from 1 Cor. xv, 26, and italicising the word *destroyed*, he introduces the *italic* supply by the translators, as a part of the original text, and confounds the sense of the whole passage. To give the sense of the passage, say, the last man shall be saved (Who is he? Ans. a) Methodist. But if you say, the last man *that* shall be saved *is a* Methodist, you imply as much as that there will be some men who will not be saved. Now as the Methodist in question is not disposed to have all men saved, he twists the good Book to suit his purposes.

The Methodist gentleman supposes that for a man to be *damned*, is to be made the subject of endless misery. If he, or any other man will prove this position, then we will give up our doctrine. We tell this gentleman, that *all* men (that is, especially all his *free agents*,) are or will be damned. Proof—Rom. v, 18. We ask the Methodist to compare Rom. v, 18, with Mark xvi, 16, and inform us what the terms *Katakrima** and *Katakrithesetai*† signify; and whether the term will damn a man at one period, and be entirely harmless at another; and if this be the case, the name of the theological-chemical agent which will neutralize his damnation, and produce a new compound in divinity? Enough for the present. H. F.

N. B. The argument of the Methodist gentleman, that the will or purpose of an Infinite Being can be opposed, and finally rendered ineffectual, by finite beings, is underserving a serious refutation, and is both impious and foolish.

"IMPORTANT QUESTIONS."

Question 1st. If the Saviour tasted death for *every man*, and gave himself a ransom for *all*, how can he see of the travail of his soul, and be *satisfied*, if ALL are not saved?

Answer. It is not our business to ask *how* these things can be. It is our business to inquire are these things so? are all men good and happy now? will all men be saved, and if not, why? It cannot be because Christ has not died for all—I am "satisfied" of that, so are you, so is Christ—He is "satisfied" in having done and suffered all that was necessary on his part—what more could he have done for his vineyard. But he is not satisfied with the conduct of sinners when they despise the riches of his grace—He would have gathered Jerusalem but they would not.

Q. 2nd. If all the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away, can ANY be left to *mourn* and lament to all eternity?

A. We are "ransomed" or "redeemed" in three respects, 1st. from the curse of the law. Gal. iii, 13. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." 1 Pet. i, 18, 19. "For as much as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:" 2nd. from the power and pollution of sin. Titus ii, 14. "Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." Rev. v, 9. "And they sung a new song, singing, thou are worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation." Rev. xiv, 3, 4. "And they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth." These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the first-fruits unto God and to the Lamb: 3rd. from the grave. Hosea, xiii, 14. I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death, O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction, repentance shall be hid from mine eyes. In the *first sense all have been* redeemed. In the *second* but few. In the third all *will* be. If in the three senses of the word all should be found redeemed at the last day, then there would be none to mourn, but this will not be the case, for when they shall come forth from the grave, at the last day, some will rise to life eternal, *others not*. Dan. xii, 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." John v, 29. "And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

Q. 3rd. How can Christ be the head of *every man*, the saviour of *all men*, and the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the *world*, if ANY man is lost?

A. *How* this can be is not my business to tell. It is certain that one man is lost, viz. Judas. It is certain, also, that he was given to Christ. John xvii, 12. "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the Son of perdition; that the Sriptures might be fulfilled." I suppose he was lost through his own fault. But if he gets to Heaven at last, the words of Christ, Matt. xxvi, 24, "The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but wo unto that man by whom the son of man is betrayed! it had been good for that man if he had not been born," are not true—for Heaven will more than compensate for all.

Q. 4th. If Christ be the propitiation for the sins of the *whole world*, how can any possibly be endlessly miserable in consequence of sin, when the Father has accepted the atonement made by the Son, and has declared himself well pleased for his righteousness sake?

A. Not by any eternal decree of Heaven, but by their own fault in rejecting Christ, in crucifying him afresh, and putting him to open shame. The greater the love of Christ, the greater the sin in slighting it, and the greater condemnation.

Q. 5th. If God was in Christ reconciling the *world* (or all men) unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, how can he punish them eternally for what he does not impute to them?

A. Don't you see the sophistry here? 1st. It is not true that all *are* reconciled unto God, for if they were, why should the Apostle say, "we pray you, be ye reconciled unto him." 2dly. It is not true that sin is not imputed to sinners. To suppose that sinners are not guilty, not responsible, not accountable for their crimes, is a very dangerous error. This is the danger of the Universal doctrine—"Sin is no longer sin"—"sin as much as you please there is no danger." When a man comes to believe this, there is no telling what sins he will commit.

Q. 6th. If grace has abounded more than sin, how can any of Adam's race be irrecoverably lost.

A. By "despising the riches of that grace," as I said, the greater the love, the greater the sin—The greater the salvation offered and provided, the greater the danger of neglecting it—"How then shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation."

Q. 7th. If every creature which is in heaven, and in the earth shall praise God, how can any be endlessly miserable?

A. It is not true that every creature, &c. will praise God to all eternity. In the prophet Isaiah it is said of some "they shall fret themselves, and curse their king and their God, and look upward," Isa. viii, 21.—In the Revelation (chap. xvi) it is said of some, "they blasphemed the God of heaven and repented not of their deeds."—What John saw and heard in the 16th chapter was *after* that related in the 5th, therefore the point in question cannot be settled by that passage.

Q. 8th. Can the purpose for which God sent

---

* Rendered condemnation in Rom. v, 18.

† Rendered damned in Mark xvi, 16. See also, John iii, 18, 19, where the same term, varied in case, etc. occurs, and is rendered condemned, and condemnation; that is, when the orthodox please to have it so, damnation; the most musical and delightful term in modern divinity. See John v, 29, *Krisecos*, damnation.

his son into the world possibly fail? If not, then the world will be saved. "For we have seen and do testify that the Father hath sent his Son to be the *Saviour of the world*." It takes each, all, and every one to make a world.

A. Yes--In some instances it may, as in the case of Jerusalem; he would have gathered them but they would not—"Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." There are some that deny the Lord that bought them and bring upon themselves swift destruction. 2 Peter ii, 1.

Q. 9th. When God says he is merciful, and *will not* cast off forever—that he will not contend forever, because he delighteth in mercy—and gives other sufficient reasons why he will not—that the souls would fail before him, &c. does it mean that he *will*, or *will not* do these things? If it mean that he *will not*—and it most certainly reads so--why do people who profess to believe God when he speaks, say that he *will do* what he says he *will not do*? Would it not be better for them, and for the cause of Christianity, to believe God, as Abraham did, that their faith might be counted to them for righteousness? "Let God be true."

A. God always means as he says—When he says "The wicked shall be turned into hell," he means so, and it is better to believe him than to believe any man—When he says "the wise shall inherit Glory," he means so, but if the wise become foolish they shall be treated according to their folly. Prov. v, 23.—Math. xxv, 1, 12, and if the wicked turn from their wickedness, "God will repent of the evil which he said he would do unto them and will do it not."—Jonah iii, 10.

Q. 10th. Is not the merciful man always merciful to his beast? Then why should not God be merciful continually to all his creatures? Is man more merciful than his maker?

A. God is *more* merciful than man, that I know, for I have felt it often. But though God is *always merciful*, he is *always just*, and "will by no means clear the guilty." Exo. xxxiv, 4. They that show no mercy shall have *judgment without mercy*." James ii, 13.

Q. 11th. Would the American Missionary Society, whose "sublime object" it is (to use their own words) to save all men—would they not do it, if they could consistent with justice and mercy? Most certainly. As this appears to be their great end and aim, the question then is, if the Missionary Society would save all men if they could, and God could save all, and all are not saved, to whom had the world best look for salvation? to the missionaries, or to the only wise God our Saviour? to frail feeble man, or to him who came into the world, that the world through him might be saved?

A. Not to the American Missionary Society, for they will not save you unless you favor their views—But to God certainly, who says "*now* is the day of salvation."—Now let me put a question—If God *has power* to save all— and *is willing* to save all *now*, why are not all *now* saved?

Q. 12th. As all are the ransomed of the Lord, the Saviour having given himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time, and the ransomed of the Lord it is said shall return and come to Zion, with songs and everlasting joy, will any be left, who are not ransomed, to suffer endless slavery? or will any be forsaken by him who has ransomed them, in consequence of his not having the will or the power to restore them to freedom, holiness, and happiness?

A. The answer to this question you will find in the answer to the second—all are *now* ransomed or redeemed from the power and pollution of sin—As to God's "*power* and *willingness* to restore them to holiness, freedom and happiness," he never will have more power, or be more willing than he is now. All are not holy and happy now—what is the reason? They will not come unto him that they might have life.

Q. 13th. As God hath declared it to be his will that *all* should be saved, and it being his will, counsel, and good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, to gather together in one *all things* in Christ—and he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will—must not all be saved and gathered together *in* Christ, or the purpose and will of God fail of being accomplished?

A. When God said by Moses to the children of Israel, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself, it was his will and purpose that his creatures should love him and each other, and be happy—the same is his will and purpose now. But man will not comply.

Q. 14th. As God hath spoken of the restoration of *all things* by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world begun, must not *all* be restored to holiness and happiness, or God's holy prophets be censured for speaking of that which is not true?

A. "The restoration of all things spoken of by all the holy prophets," means, "The gathering together from among Jews and Gentiles those who by believing become *one in Christ*. This has been done in part, and is now going on, but remember, "it shall come to pass that every soul that will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed." Acts. iii, 23.

Q. 15th. If the punishment of sin be the second death, and the Mediator is to destroy death, and him that hath its power—if death shall be swallowed up in victory, and there shall be no more death, how can it with propriety be said that such a thing as endless pain or "eternal death" can exist in all God's creation?

A. There is a little sophistry in this question. The punishment of sin is the second death truly. But the Mediator has not engaged to destroy *that* death. "The last enemy that shall be *destroyed* is death, and the rest shall be put under his feet." 1st Cor. xv, 25. The death of the body is there meant—see particularly verses 22d, 23d, and 44.

Q. 16th. If Christ hath made peace through the blood of his cross, to reconcile all things to himself, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven, how can it be possible for any to remain irreconciled to God, or be forever miserable?

A. Some are *unreconciled* to God now. They are "haters of God." Rom. i, 30.

Q. 17th. If those days of which the Saviour spake more than seventeen hundred years ago, were the days of vengeance, that all things written should be fulfilled—if he was revealed from heaven—came in the glory of his Father with his holy angels, to reward every man according to his work, to take vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ—if all these things were to be fulfilled before that generation passed away, according to his repeated declarations, can any of these threatenings be found, which have not been fulfilled? And if this was the greatest tribulation that had ever taken place, or ever would, such as was not from the beginning of the world to that time, no, nor ever should be—why do we hear of a greater day of judgment, greater tribulation? Can there be a greater than the greatest? The greatest ever to happen, took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, when these days of vengeance and tribulation were fulfilled.

A. The *generation* of the Jews has not passed away yet. Christ has not come the second time yet. The premises are wrong, therefore the conclusion is false.

Q. 18th. If God hath concluded *all* in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon *all*, will he not do that which he purposed to do? And will not the Jews be brought in with the fulness of the Gentiles, and so all Israel be saved?

A. All the true Israel will be saved, doubtless—but he that believeth not shall be *damned*.

Q. 19th. If Christ shall destroy the works of the Devil, if *all* things are to be made new, and there is to be no more death, no more sorrow and sighing, neither any more pain—if tears are to be wiped from off *all* faces, how can any such thing as pain and suffering remain while God exists?

A. The time will surely come when the righteous shall weep no more—but it shall not be so with the wicked; for them is reserved weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. Sin and suffering do exist now, and may forever exist, unless God or man changes.

Q. 20th. If every knee shall bow, and every tongue swear that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength, he being made unto all righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, what more can they have to make them holy and happy? And if *all flesh* shall see the salvation of God, will not all have these perfections? Will not *all* know God, from the least to the greatest, and have eternal life?

A. Every knee does not, will not bow to Christ—what is the reason? The pride of the heart.

Q. 21st. Can the will of God be defeated? If it cannot, then will not all be saved? For God *will have all men to be saved*, and come to the knowledge of the truth.

A. Yes—It is his will that *you* should be *holy* and *happy now*, now is the accepted time. If you are not holy and happy, you resist and defeat his will.

Q. 22nd. If the whole creation, which was made subject to vanity, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, and brought into the glorious liberty of the children of God, will any be miserable world without end?

A. Yes—even that may be—for it is the "redemption of the body," that is there spoken of, and when God shall "ransom the body from the grave and redeem it from death" it may never enter heaven. Dan. xii, 2. John v, 29. "Some shall rise to life eternal, and some to everlasting shame and contempt."

Q. 23rd. When he that sitteth on the throne shall make all things new, will he make a new hell for the wicked?

A. Yes—"the first hell shall be cast into the new hell, i. e. "the lake of fire"—the second death." Rev. xx, 14, 15. "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." There needs no other hell than the lake of fire. This will be all sufficient.

Q. 24th. Said a member of the society of Friends, what is the use of the orthodox hell? Does it make God more happy? No. Does it make the saints more holy? No. Does it reform the sinner? No. The devil is no better for it, neither saints or sinners—then "what is the use?"

A. If one of the society of Friends asks again "what is the use of the orthodox hell?" please to answer him thus, viz. "To put the naughty man in, and all that are like him." To keep them out of the way of the good—that they trouble not the righteous.

As to the use of preaching hell, let them ask Christ who preached it more than any one before—one great use is to keep men from going there—reader, may God save thee from it.

"LOVE YOUR ENEMIES."

This duty was in precept and example, taught us by the Redeemer of the world. But alas! how little is it heeded, even by those who have named the name of Christ. How often do we discover the spirit of revenge and retaliation, bursting from the bosoms of those who profess to have been taught in the school "of the meek and lowly Jesus," upon such as through prejudice, they suppose to be inimical to true religion, because they do not subscribe to their creed. These things ought not so to be.—*Ind. Mess.*

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY T. J. SAWYER AND P. PRICE.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1831.

We owe an apology to our readers for the length of some of the articles in our present number, and consequent want of variety in its columns. The wish to give the sermon of Br. Andrews entire, and the earnest desire of some of our friends to have the *Important Questions* and *remarks* appended, appear, from some local interest attached to them, must be our excuse. It is a difficulty usually attendant on the commencement of works of this kind, but we shall endeavor to obviate it as speedily as possible. We take this occasion to reiterate a suggestion of a respected Ministering Brother, "'Brevity is (not only) the soul of wit;' but of a religious Paper," and we hope correspondents will bear us in mind in this respect. P.

FORGIVENESS.

In a world like this it is impossible but that offences will come. Passion uncontrolled, or adverse interest will sometimes lead men to speak and act inconsistent with the well-being and happiness of their neighbors. Insult and injury too often excite anger and provoke retaliation. The injured in turn becomes the injurer. Thus the flame of discord once lighted up would spread and rage forever, were there no counteracting principles to stay its progress and abate its fury.

That principle is found in *forgiveness*, whose exercise is most imperiously required by the religion of Christ. Without a forgiving spirit indeed it is impossible to be a christian. We must love our enemies and pray for those that despitefully use us and persecute us. Even in our prayers we are taught to supplicate forgiveness only so far as we forgive others. "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." Our Saviour adds by way of comment, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." How few reflect while offering this petition *forgive us our debts*, that they ask only for such treatment at the hands of their Father, as they manifest toward their erring brethren! How few would willingly abide their own judgment when that judgment was to be awarded to themselves! If the remembrance of our frequent sins against God is insufficient to excite a forgiving spirit towards even our enemies, ought not the consciousness of our own liability, perhaps our proneness, to err in our intercourse with mankind, at least to soften our resentments and move us to clemency? S.

It was remarked by Livy, we think, that men easily come to *believe* what they *wish* to be true. This remark has often been alluded to in order to account for the rapid extension of the Universalist faith. Whatever truth it may generally contain, we should be extremely unwilling to apply it to our opposers; for we bear the greatest part of them witness, that their faith and the best wishes and most fervent prayers of their hearts are wholly discordant. We know not how it is, but so it verily happens, that the believers in endless misery think it no slight confirmation of their faith that it is altogether unlike what they most heartily desire. We are disposed to think otherwise, notwithstanding the observation of the Roman historian. Still if our opposers insist that our faith has its foundation only in our wishes that it might be true, we will receive it as no ordinary compliment to the benevolence of our feelings, and would simply ask them for the future not to charge such *well-wishers* of the human race with possessing the worst of characters, and with *desiring* to subvert the pillars of religion and to open the very flood-gates of licentiousness and iniquity. S.

MORSE'S REPLY

TO PARKER'S "LECTURES ON UNIVERSALISM."

We learn by a late "Magazine and Advocate," that Br. Pitt Morse, of Watertown, N. Y. has made a formal reply to the lectures of Mr. Parker. We doubt not his work is faithfully done. But we could wish the little volume to which he has answered, had been more worthy the labors of his pen. Mr. Parker has a full share of the ill will, common with his sect, to Universalism; a spice of the love of misrepresentation, and a "double portion" of *ignorance*. To say that he *knew nothing* of the doctrine which he attempted to refute, would be but saying what every intelligent reader of his lectures must have observed. He boasts, it is true, of his acquaintance with Universalism; but in the sequel it seems he gained his knowledge of it from Edwards against Chauncey, withouthaving ever read Chauncey himself. Besides, had he known any thing of the subject,he could not have been ignorant of the notorious fact that there is in all probability not a hundred, perhaps I might safely say a dozen, Universalists in America who adopt the views of Chauncey. Had Mr. Parker known as much of Universalism as some of his older and wiser brethren, like them he would have kept silence. But we admire his zeal, however much we may pity his ignorance or despise his miserable logic. We wish his little book might be generally read for we believe his labors very serviceable to the cause he would endeavor to destroy. Even his own friends, we should think, could not read his puerile arguments and observe his palpable sophistry without beginning seriously to question the truth of the shocking dogma of endless misery.

As many of Br. Morse's Reply might probably be disposed of in this city and neighborhood, we take this opportunity to ask the publisher to forward us a supply for sale as soon as convenient. S.

Many of our subscribers in the city, may not have received our first number. Several names, we understand, which have not been returned to us, are on subscription Papers yet in circulation, and we would thank our friends to hand them in, as early as possible, that we may enter them on our list. Some omissions, also, may have occurred through our carriers. These, however, will be obviated, as soon as the routes become familiar. In all cases of failure, we wish early information at the office, and they will be promptly attended to P.

A word to those who exchange with us.—We would particularly request them, in forwarding their Papers, to address them "*Christian* Messenger." Complaint is made at our Post-Office that Papers come directed "Messenger," and much confusion does and will occur in separating those for this Paper and "*Badger's Weekly Messenger.*" This circumstance was not thought of, in adopting our Title. A little care, however, on the part of those who exchange with us will prevent all difficulty. Letters and communications, as will be perceived by a note in the Paper, should be addressed "P. Price," which will be a sufficient distinction. P.

MODERN REVIVALS.

"*By their fruits ye shall know them.*"

The Utica Magazine, of recent date, gives an account of another tragical death, from religious madness. The unfortunate subject of it was a young man, aged 22, by the name of Geo. B. Butler, of New-Berlin, N. Y. He had resided for some months in the vicinity of Clinton, N. Y., but returned to his father's house in New-Berlin on the 6th of September, in a state of derangement. Little could be learned from him except that he had experienced religion about four weeks previous, and "was happy." Subsequently he had imbibed the idea that "God had forsaken him and left him in the dark, and that he should never behold the light again." On the morning of the 8th he was discovered in his room, by his mother, in the act of self-destruction. She found him with one hand grasped firmly on his throat, and with the other hand he was thrusting a dull pointed pocket knife into it. The weapon was takenfrom him, and he then clenched his wounded neck with his hands and "literally tore his own flesh asunder." Surgical aid was called, but to no purpose. He lingered about three hours in the greatest agony.

A late number of the Courier and Enquirer, gives an account of a very respectable young lady of this city, who committed suicide by drowning, in consequence of religious phrenzy and despair.

The Dover Palladium states that a respectable woman of Portsmouth, attempted to drown herself, from the same cause, but was prevented by the timely assistance of persons present.

The New-Hampshire Patriot says, that a young lady of genteel appearance recently arrived in that place in one of the Boston stages, whose mind appears a complete wreck. She can neither tell from whence she came, or whither she is going. The few words she utters relates to the excitements so prevalent at this time, and her only inquiry is for "*four days' meetings.*"

The Norwich Journal states that a Mrs. Aurelia Lyman, of Guilford, attempted to put a period to her existence, by cutting her throat with a razor. Surgical aid was immediately called, but it was too late. She had been a professor of religion for many years, and was regarded a pious and sincere christian; but was impelled to the act under the impression that she had been unfaithful in her christian character.

A lady of our acquaintance, says the Christian Intelligencer, hitherto sustaining an excellent

character as a wife, mother, and neighbor, has been driven to despair and insanity by a four days' meeting, and sent to the Hospital in Hartford.

In the Utica Magazine, of November 5, we find an account of still *another victim*. A young man of promise, by the name of Otis Bates, hung himself at Ellsburg, on the evening of the 15th ult. He attended a revival meeting at Bellville, in June last, where his passions were excited to that degree he became a wretched maniac. He continued in this situation, most of the time, 'till the day of his death; when he attended a similar meeting at Ellisburg. He left the meeting about 8 o'clock in the evening, and about 11 o'clock, was found a corpse in his father's barn. The Magazine states, that "the amiable mother of Mr. Bates is now apparently near her end, (her sickness being evidently occasioned by the trouble which the insanity and suicide of her son had produced in her mind,) and that two or three cases of insanity, and one other death, had occurred in the same neighborhood, from religious mania." We are unable to furnish more than a brief summary—to give the particulars in full of every account which reaches us, would swell the list altogether beyond our room. P.

ADVANCE OF LIBERAL PRINCIPLES.

As some alleviation to the melancholy reflections which the foregoing is calculated to produce in every breast, not devoid of the common sympathies of our nature, we turn with pleasure to a notice of the steady, and in many places, rapid advance of Liberal principles. To the Universalist, particularly, it is matter of joy and rejoicing, to witness the unparallelled progress of the Doctrine of Universal Benevolence in various sections of our country, notwithstanding the active measures of its enemies to impede its course.

Universal Benevolence! can it be possible there is a single human being who would not joy in its progress? Yea, judging from their conduct, even so it is. Though in all for which we contend, we contend not for ourselves alone, but for the *whole* family of man, yet we are met by the most virulent opposition—we encounter almost every opprobrious epithet which distempered feelings can devise, and our sentiment is denounced as the "Doctrine of *Devils!*" Christian reader, can it be that the *Devil* prompts us to these benevolent feelings towards our fellow men? we think not, and should suppose the genuine feeling of benevolence in every *Christian* heart would prompt them to bid us God speed, even though they might not be able to comprehend the *purposes* of our Heavenly Father, to the full extent that we do ourselves. But to our purpose. Accounts from almost every section of the country, give the most encouraging view of the state of our sentiment, and affords the strongest inducements to renewed exertions in diffusing its beneficial influence. In New-Haven, Conn. for a long period the strong hold of Limitarianism in Connecticut, a Society of Universalists has recently been formed, we understand, under very favorable circumstances. We notice with pleasure, the names of some, with whom we have been long acquainted. In Fairfield County, also, our friends are making laudable exertions. Societies have recently been formed in Newtown and Norwalk, and the Society in Danbury, we believe, is in very prosperous circumstances. In North Salem, in this state, though not accommodated with stated preaching, our friends meet regularly every Sabbath, for religious exercises and reading. In the northern and western part of the state, Societies are increasing rapidly. In Vermont, says the Watchman, Revivals of common sense are going on rapidly in Corinth, Woodstock, Bridgewater, &c. In addition to the formation of Societies, and the general prosperity of the cause, we notice by the Utica Magazine, that "a Presbyterian Clergyman of Havanna, New-York, has lately embraced the gospel preached unto Abraham, and is now laboring occasionally with the Universalist Society in that town'—and that the Rev. Alonzo Chapman, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in Smithville, N. Y. has renounced the doctrine of endless misery and embraced that of God's universal grace and salvation. We wish them all joy and peace in believing, and a rich reward in their new field of labor. P.

TRIUMPH OF TRUTH.

We have received from Br. Thomas, of Philadelphia, a copy of a pamphlet bearing the above title, and which is referred to in our notice of the N. Y. and Philadelphia Association. We are highly gratified with its contents, and believe it calculated to do much good. It consists of 14 articles, under distinct heads, though arranged in reference to their respective bearing, so as to form a whole; comprising a view of the Outward Visible Church—of Universalism—The actual difference between Universalism and Partialism—Defects of Partialism, &c. It is written with much candor and feeling, and commends itself at once to the good sense and reason of mankind. We should think no one, even opposers, could find fault with its spirit. We hope to have a supply, for sale, within a few days. We have room only for the following extract: P.

DICTATES OF BENEVOLENCE.

Partialists most freely acknowledge, that if they were possessed of sufficient power, they would redeem the whole human race—that if their ability to accomplish, were commensurate with their benevolence, not a single soul would be suffered to endure the agonies of a never-dying—endless death.

And I have heard Partialist clergymen declare, from the pulpit, with tears in their eyes, that, if they possessed the power, they would embrace the whole world of mankind in the arms of love, and present them spotless, before the throne of the Almighty.

We admire their benevolence. Their merciful disposition elicits no little esteem. But we humbly entreat them to inquire, whether they are more merciful than God?

Surely, if man, with all his frailties and imperfections, desires Universal Salvation, and would accomplish it, if he possessed adequate power, God is no less benevolent; and as He is Almighty, no doubt He *will* effect what man would bestow, if power was not wanting. T.

UNIVERSALIST EXPOSITOR.

The second volume of this valuable periodical commenced in June last. As many of our patrons are probably unacquainted with the work, we shall be permitted to speak briefly of its merits. The first Vol. was conducted in its editorial department by the Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, and the Rev. Hosea Ballou, 2d, of Roxbury, gentlemen, the former of whom is universally known and highly esteemed, and the talents and learning of the latter extensively, though we think not sufficiently, appreciated among all our churches. As to the character of the work we will let the publishers speak for themselves. "It is intended to be substantially the paper of the order of Universalists. It will contain critical expositions of various texts of Scripture; explanations of scriptural phrases and subjects; dissertations on points of biblical literature; essays on a variety of moral and religious subjects; doctrinal discussions, and expositions, both illustrative and historical, of religious truth in general; together with Reviews of such works as are peculiarly interesting to Universalists." It is no slight praise to say that the high character which the work assumes has thus far been well sustained, and that every expectation of its friends, it is believed, has been fully realized.

The present Vol. has engaged, in addition to the labors of the above mentioned editors, the services of the Rev. L. S. Everett, of Charlestown, and with a deservedly increasing patronage promises a more extensive usefulness. It is apparent to all, that our denomination needs a work of the kind under consideration, a suitable repository of the more labored and permanently valuable productions of our first minds. It does not interfere with our common periodicals, as it embraces none of their objects, unless in a higher and more extensive sense.

We have not time to speak so fully as we could wish, or indeed as we may take opportunity to do hereafter, of the merits of the work, but shall frequently gratify our readers with articles entire, or extracts from it, that they may judge for themselves.

Subscriptions received by the publishers' agent at this office. Price $2, per annum, on delivery of the first number. S.

Br. O. Whiston, late of this city, has accepted an invitation from the Universalist Society in Oswego, N. Y.

NOTICE.—Br. S. J. Hillyer, will preach at the Town House in Norwalk, Ct. Sunday, the 20th inst.

PICKERING'S LECTURES.

Samuel W. Wheeler, of Providence, R. I. proposes publishing a new Edition of *Pickering's Lectures in defence of Divine Revelation*. In some future No. we will notice them more particularly. Subscriptions received at this office. Persons in the city, desiring the work, can leave their names either with our carriers or at the office, and they will be furnished as soon as it is issued from the press.—Price 75 cts. bound & lettered.

GENESEE ASSOCIATION.

This association recently met at Penfield, N. Y. and organized by choosing Br. *Isaac Whitnell*, Moderator, and Br. *Charles Hammond* and *Oliver Ackly*, Clerks. Ordination was conferred on Brs. Charles Hammond, George Washington Montgomery, and Elijah Smith. Letters of fellowship were granted to Brs. Simeon Dutcher and Levi L. Sadler. Ten new Societies were received into fellowship. An additional association was also formed, to be known by the name of the "*Niagara Association of Universalists.*" Discourses were delivered on the occasion by the following Brethren. L. L. Sadler, W. I. Reese, J. S. Flagler, A. B. Grosh, G. Messenger. The session is said to have been highly interesting, and the circular, by Br. Reese, gives flattering accounts of the rapid progress in that section, of the soul cheering doctrine of Universal Benevolence. We would give the circular this week, but for the want of room. The Genesee Association adjourned to meet in East-Bloomfield on the second Wednesday and the following Thursday of Oct. 1832, and the Niagara Association on the first Wednesday and following Thursday of the same month.

N. Y. & PHILADELPHIA ASSOCIATION.

We have received, *by the Boston Trumpet*, the minutes of the New-York and Philadelphia Association of Universalists, which met at Easton, Pa. Oct. 15th, 1831. For the want of room, we are unable to give, this week, the proceedings entire, or the interesting Circular by Br. Fuller. The articles submitted by the Committee, of a previous Association, to prepare a Pamphlet on Universalism, were accepted and ordered to be printed under the direction of Br. Thomas. The next meeting is at Princeton, N. J. on the first Wednesday and following Thursday in Oct. 1832.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

A few hints to those who HOPE *and* PRAY *for the salvation of all mankind.*

My dear friends, do you sincerely *hope* and *pray* that God will finally save all mankind from their sins, and bring every wayward son and daughter of Adam to a state of holiness and happiness, and that he will cause all the kindreds of the earth to worship and adore his holy name to all eternity? I trust if you be true christians and "love your enemies," as you are commanded to do, you will answer yes—Then let me tell you, my friends, if you thus answer in the affirmative, that you by your own words confess yourselves to be Universalists—For if you seriously *hope* and *pray* for the salvation of all men, you must necessarily admit the *possibility* of their salvation, for surely, no man can with any propriety or sincerity hope and pray for the salvation of all men, and at the same time believe their salvation impossible—can a man pray with any faith or sincerity for an impossibility? Surely not.

We dread death, and would if possible cling to this earth forever; but do we pray to be exempted from the common lot of all men, and to continue here forever? No, because we know or are well assured it is impossible—we know it is useless and vain in us to pray for an impossibility. So it would seem equally useless and vain in us to pray for the salvation of all men if we considered their salvation impossible or even improbable; for no man can pray in faith for the salvation of all men, and at the same time be-

lieve their salvation to be either impossible or improbable. Therefore, it follows of necessity that whoever hopes and prays for the salvation of all men admits the possibility and also the probability of their salvation, and any person who admits either the possibility or probability of the salvation of all men, is a Universalist. There are but very few Universalists, I trust, who pretend to *know* or to be absolutely *certain*, of the salvation of all men, they only *hope* and *pray* and believe it *possible*, that "God will have all men to be saved," just as you yourselves do: and after having admitted the possibility of the final salvation of all men, and acknowledged that "with God all things are possible," you cannot with any propriety teach the doctrine of endless misery, for by teaching this doctrine you at once teach that what you admitted to be possible, is actually *impossible!* Therefore, my friends, I warn you to be cautious how you embrace a doctrine which necessarily forbids you to pray for the salvation of all men: for if you teach that endless misery is absolutely a true doctrine, you teach that the salvation of all men is impossible, and if you pray for the salvation of all men, you necessarily admit that what you have been teaching to be utterly impossible, is *possible*, and are therefore Universalists—For as I have before observed, Universalists do not say that they *know* all men will be saved, they only, like yourselves, *hope* and *pray* for it, and believe it *possible*.

UNIVERSAL SUPPLICATIONIST.

Stamford, Conn.

FOR THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

In order to arrive at truth in Theology, we must have just conceptions of the character of God. If we attempt to build a system of divinity upon false premises, and if we maintain a consistency with our leading principles, our whole superstructure will be a groundless chimera. Again, if we start upon a sound basis, and carefully adhere to our starting point, that is, if we keep up a consistency throughout, it is impossible that our system be wrong.

If we should take for granted that our heavenly Father is infinite, unchangeable hatred, and build upon this false foundation, and draw inferences from an attribute so malevolent, we could, with ease and consistency, establish the doctrine of endless misery. This would be the natural and inevitable result from such premises. But the starting point being false, the whole system is nothing better. Hence the great importance of having a strong basis upon which to build.

"*God is Love.*" This sacred declaration is big with meaning, and contains a truth that stands at the head of all just Theology. We unhesitatingly pronounce every system false that does not acknowledge this hallowed truth. Blot this holy sentiment from the divine record, and you enshroud that sacred volume in impenetrable darkness. All that reverence the Christian religion, acknowledge that God is love.

Another attribute belonging to the divine character, is *immutability*. "I am the Lord, I change not." With him there is neither variableness, nor shadow of turning. From these two truths, (viz.) his immutability, and his nature, which is love, we take this position, God is unchangeable love. We say then, he loves now, and he eternally will love every human being to whom he has given existence. He is *God* to *all*, and as he is *love*, he must be *love* to *all*, and as he is *unchangeable*, he must *love* all as long as they exist. In accordance with this, is the testimony of the sacred record. "God so loved the world," etc. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us." "We love him because he *first* loved us." "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." It is unnecessary to urge more evidence to prove that God loves all his intelligent offspring. But should any still say that God hates a part of the workmanship of his own hands, they must, upon a little reflection, perceive that he must have hated these same beings the very moment he gave them existence, and that he eternally will hate them, for he cannot change. To say that a being can hate at one time, and love at another, and yet not change, is any thing but good sense.

If the ground we have taken is true, (and none dare deny it,) we infer that hatred does not belong to the divine character. Two principles, so diametrically opposite in their natures as are love and hatred, cannot exist in a perfect being. We might as well expect that light and darkness, heat and cold, emanate from the sun.

Another attribute belonging to the Deity is *wisdom*, and as he is unchangeable, this wisdom must be infinite, for that which is not infinite, can be increased or diminished, and consequently is changeable. But God is immutable, therefore he is infinite in wisdom, for known unto him are all his works, from the begining to the end. Another prominent attribute is *power*. The great Jehovah is *Almighty*, and doeth according to his will, in the army of heaven, and amongst the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand.

Reader, let us now bring our minds to bear upon a few important points. And here let it be remarked there is nothing like candour upon the subject of religion. The moment we show a want of it, we satisfy the intelligent, that truth is not our object. Let us therefore lay aside all prejudice, and sincerely search for truth. Let us agree whenever we can, and not contend merely for the mastery. There are three points about which there can be no dispute. We will here mention them. 1st. God is immutable love. 2nd. He is infinitely wise. 3rd. He is Almighty in power.

When God was about to create a world of intelligent beings, he must have had a design. It is impossible for infinite wisdom to act without some motive or intention. Even finite man has an object in whatever he attempts to perform. If we admit that God had a design in the creation of his offspring, we are next led to inquire what that design was, whether good or evil. We here ask, can love design any thing contrary to its own nature? Certainly not. Did love design the endless misery of a part of the human family? No, for nothing short of infinite hatred could prompt an intention so malevolent. Endless misery is the exact opposite of endless happiness. One attribute cannot design two things so opposite. Opposite effects must have opposite causes. The sun cannot at the same time emit light and darkness. It cannot both freeze and burn the substance with which it comes in contact. If it is the nature of love, to give existence for a blessing, it cannot be the nature of that same love to confer existence for an endless curse.

After thus premising, we say that our heavenly Father designed that man should be a gainer by his existence; that all men should receive more happiness than misery. This certainly is no rash conclusion. If we have a right to think upon the subject at all, we know of no other at which we could arrive. The voice of inspiration testifies in accordance with this position. "Having made known unto us, the mystery of his *will*, according to his good *pleasure*, which he hath *purposed* in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth even in him." "God *will* have *all* men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth." It is unnecessary to adduce more testimony to prove that our Father in heaven designs the ultimate holiness, and consequent happiness of all men.

One of three propositions must be true. There cannot be a fourth. 1st. God designed the final purity and happiness of all men. 2nd. He designed the eternal wickedness and misery of a part or all. 3rd. He had no design whatever when he made man. The last idea is atheistical, for it virtually denies the existence of God. The 2nd position, while it admits the being of Deity, gives him a character as bad as it is in the power of man to conceive. It charges the God of love with calling into being, creatures that could not offend antecedent to their existence for the sole purpose of tormenting them eternally. This hypothesis is at such an open war with every thing that deserves the name of truth, we hardly think any of our readers will for one moment ever imagine it true. We are again brought back upon our first position, viz. infinite and unchangeable love designed the ultimate happiness of all men.

The next important idea that presents itself is this. Can infinite wisdom err? Can supreme intelligence be disappointed? Can the all-wise be deceived? Can the infinite Jehovah make a mistake? Unless we would close our eyes and be content with a superficial examination of Theology, these momentous questions must be put. And who can answer them in the affirmative? Who dares say that he who has contrived the universe so that such perfect harmony exists in revolving worlds, has erred in regard to man's final end? The very thought is impious.

The next idea that presents itself is this. Can Almighty power be resisted? Can the creature baffle the designs of the omnipotent creator? Will man's will triumph over God's? Is the Almighty's power governed by fragile man's? Here again we must shrink into the contracted circle of ignorance, or listen to these queries. If we do not wish to know any thing beyond what our forefathers believed, let us close our eyes and refuse to think. For if we examine this subject with that candor that ever characterizes him that sincerely desires the truth, we shall most assuredly arrive at truth to which the unthinking world never yet have attained. Can we answer these questions in the affirmative? Better deny the existence of God at once. To make his will subservient to man's, and his power depend upon the creature's, amounts to a virtual acknowledgment that there is no God, for that being whose designs are baffled by his creatures, cannot be almighty; and if not omnipotent, he cannot be the true Jehovah.

One of three things must be denied, or our argument is irresistible. We must either reject that position which argues the infinite unchangeable *love* of God, or that which teaches his infinite *wisdom*, or that which contends for his almighty *power*, or we must acknowledge that the time will come when all men will be holy and happy. Which side of this triangle will you reject? One must be abandoned, or the conclusion is inevitable. Sophistry may indeed divert the mind, and lead it off from this mathematical argument, but after wandering ever so far, whenever we are crowded, we must come to this point. We must say with one party, that God has *goodness* enough to save *all*, but that the creature won't let him, and thus deny his power or wisdom, or with another, that God is a sovereign, and therefore has *wisdom* and *power* enough to save *all*, but no *disposition*, and thus reject his *goodness*, or we must say with a third party that he has *love*, *wisdom* and *power* enough to save all, and consequently deny none of the attributes of God. Turn this subject and twist it which way you will, it still comes to this. None but a Universalist can consistently acknowledge the three prominent attributes of God.

S. J. H.

New-York, Oct. 25th, 1831.

FOR THE MESSENGER.

CHRIST WALKING ON THE SEA.

MATT.. xiv. 22—33.

He walked the waves, and manly hearts
With fear were throbbing high,
When lo! a voice above the storm,
Came breathing, "*It is I.*"

And peace sank gently on each breast
And calmed each troubled eye:—
What was the spell, to gift with power,
These simple words "Tis I"?

Faith! Faith! firm trusting in His love,
Whose love can never die—
What had the storm for them to fear,
When he had said "Tis I"?

Oh, thou, who in thy wisdom bid'st
Dark trials on us lie,
Hush every murmur as it swells
And whisper "It is I."

And when earth's long-loved forms have fled,
And death's dark shades are nigh,
Stretch forth thy hand to lead us through,
Soft breathing "It is I."

C. M. S.

FROM THE RURAL REPOSITORY.

DEVOTION.

She knelt, she prayed, I watched her eye,
A glistening tear was there;
I heard her breathe the lowly sigh,
The simple fervent prayer.

She deem'd no listening mortal near
To catch that gentle sigh;
That none there was to see the tear
That gemmed her lifted eye.

But oh! she knew, and she was bless'd,
To know there was an ear
That heard the breathings of her breast—
Her God, she felt, was near.

We extract the following from some Editorial remarks in the New Hampshire Patriot. Though the clouds of Bigotry and Superstition have lowered darkly, we think there is a redeeming spirit abroad, which promises speedy redemption from the thraldom of misguided zeal and fanaticism. But a short time since, scarcely a secular journal in our country could summon resolution to raise a warning voice against the present powerful and concerted measures every where in operation, and every where accumulating and thickening around us, with the direct *tendency*, if not with the direct *intention*, of binding us down in worse than Egyptian bondage. And *now*, we can point to numbers, who have taken the most firm and decided stand. It must be a source of high gratification to every ardent friend of religious liberty, to see them, one by one, coming out and zealously enlisting in the cause of liberal principles. For ourselves, we have no confidence whatever, in a religion that would proscribe every thing that did not measure precisely with itself—that in its zeal to observe *one* command of our heavenly Father, should break *ten*. We do not think it profitable to the possessor, or advantageous to the community in which he moves. Yet we are no enemies to genuine religion—as says the Patriot, *we are among its warmest friends*, but we wish to see a religion which is not confined to forms and ceremonies *in* the sanctuary, but will *go out* with its possessor *into the world*, will follow him to his workshop or his store, and characterize him in all his dealings with mankind—a religion which works by *Love*, and purifies the heart, and leads

> "Man to meet his fellow man in peace;
> To spurn the chain, the sceptre and the rod
> And raise his hands un-manacled to God."

We care not by what name it is called, give us the *fruits*, and we will never quarrel about its designation. We shall make occasional extracts of this kind, to give our readers some brief record of the "spirit of the times," believing it will be as acceptable to them, generally, as any thing we could say on the subject. P.

"Some of our friends, sincere ones, we doubt not, have gently admonished us, for admitting into our columns communications reflecting upon the conduct of orthodox priests and deacons, in their new process for acquiring power and influence: not that they themselves regret to see it, but that they fear the consequences may be prejudicial to ourselves. Our answer is, our's is a FREE PRESS, as untramelled by *prejudice*, and *bigotry*, as it is free to vindicate the rights of the people. "Unawed by influence and unbribed by gain," we shall not hesitate to open our columns and raise our voice, whenever we see danger to our country, in the *concerted* movements of *any combination* of men, whether *politicians* or *religionists*—whether attempting it by the acts of the *political demagogue*, or by the whining, canting hypocrisy of *religious fanatics*. And is it not time to speak out, and in a voice of thunder, too, when we see the influence of priests exerted to interrupt the regular course of industry—when we see them *demanding* an attendance upon *them, twice every day in the week*; when we see them, by their insiduous arts, alienating the affections of wives from their husbands, and children from their parents, and destroying the harmony and peace of families—peopling our mad houses with maniacs—causing suicides and murders—spreading a gloom over the smiling face of God's heritage, and introducing distrust, discontent and wretchedness, where all should be confidence, quiet and harmony? At such a time, shall the press close its columns and remain an idle spectator of the subversion of the liberties of the people? Shall we fold our hands until we see the *inquisition* and the *rack* established among us? God forbid.

Those who are at all familiar with history must know to what abuses the religion of the meek and lowly Jesus has been subjected, in all ages and countries—and must be familiar with the horrors and bloodshed produced by religious fanaticism, led on by men claiming to be acting under the sanction of the Most High. Human nature has not changed since the days of Cromwell; and if priests are suffered to rob the people of their senses, and to lead their reason captive, what guarantee have we, that those of this country will be less intolerant than of any other? Priests are men; ambitious and fallible in all things like other men; nor is there less danger to be apprehended from a combination of them than from any other combination. Nay, there is more danger; for *superstition* has thrown about them a sanctity, calculated to awe the multitude into submission to their dogmas.

We are aware that for the expression of such sentiments as these, we shall be stigmatized by those who are *interested* in getting up the present excitements, as *infidels*. Be it so—we have already been so stigmatized by them again and again, but we spurn the imputation. WE ARE THE FRIENDS OF RELIGION, and would see it maintained in all its original purity and simplicity—hallowing the conduct of men and exhibiting itself in works of charity and mercy, reconciling man to his Maker and imparting a holy serenity and cheerfulness over the face of nature. And as such, we will not hesitate to expose the hypocrisy and fraud of those designing men, who assume religion as a cloak to cover the most unhallowed designs."

FEUDAL TYRANNY AND PRIESTCRAFT.

If a free born man, in our day, wishes to know the wisdom of the laws by which he is protected, and the value of the institutions which secures to him his liberty—let him, for a moment, turn to those dark ages of Europe, when the cunning priests contrived to become masters of the will, the fortunes, and the consciences of mankind; when, taking advantage of the weakness and credulity of the human mind, they shackled the consciences with the strong chains of superstition, and took possession of the earth in the name of heaven, promising the rewards of the other world, to obtain for themselves the enjoyments of the good things of this: let him contemplate, also, those dreadful periods of discord and barbarism; that lone night, illuminated for the historian but by the torch of fanaticism, when the widow and the orphan had need of private vengeance to supply the impotence of the laws: when force was every where assuming the place of right, and it became necessary for a man, to do himself justice, to appeal to the sword alone.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

A QUESTION.

Why is it that most orthodox preachers fellowship Universalism *in* their churches, whilst they denounce it as so unscriptural and dangerous a sentiment *out* of them? We very well know that there are persons of Universalist sentiments who are members in good standing in orthodox churches. Some of them indeed, such as may happen to be poor in this world's goods and of little popularity or fashionable influence in the community, get excommunicated and anathematized for their "damnable heresy," while others, men of property, and standing, are allowed to enjoy their membership undisturbed. Nay, they are accounted the best sheep of the fold, against whom it will by no means answer to whisper a word of complaint. We ask, why is this thing so? Is there no hypocrisy, no favoritism, no respect for men's persons in all this? We ask again—How is it that Universalism *in* churches is so innocent a thing? when *out* of them it is such a terrible heresy? such a sure evidence of depravity and wickedness.

UNIVERSALIST BOOKS
FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE.

Life of John Murray.
Winchester's Dialogues.
Pettipiere on Divine Goodness.
Ancient History of Universalism.
Modern do. do.
Ballou on Atonement.
do. Notes on the Parables.
Universalist Expositor, Vol. 1. (bound.)
Streeters' New Hymn Book, 3d and 4th Ed.
Catechisms by Brs. Smith, Balch, Reese, and a Clergyman in Massachusetts.
Ballou's Catechism.
Parable of the Sheep and Goats, by T. Whittemore
" Rich Man and Lazarus Do.
100 arguments for Universalism. Do
Pickering's Lectures, in defence of Revelation.
120 reasons, for Universalism, by Paul Dean.
Dissertation on Revivals, by M. Rayner.
Sunday School Hymn Books.

Messenger Office, Oct. 29.

☞All letters and communications relating to this paper, must be addressed "P. Price, No. 1, Chatham Square, New-York."

Printed by J. M. DANFORTH, 53 Fulton-street.